arXiv:1701.07400v1 [quant-ph] 25 Jan 2017

Two Roads to Classicality

Bob Coecke* John Selby*† Sean Tull*
*Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford
†Department of Physics, Imperial College London

***Abstract*—Mixing and decoherence are both manifestations of classicality within quantum theory, each of which admit a very general category-theoretic construction. We show under which conditions these two 'roads to classicality' coincide. This is indeed the case for (finite-dimensional) quantum theory, where each construction yields the category of C*-algebras and completely positive maps. We present counterexamples where the property fails which includes relational and modal theories. Finally, we provide a new interpretation for our category-theoretic generalisation of decoherence in terms of 'leaking information'.**

I. Introduction

This paper is concerned with categorical structures for representing theories of physical processes, and in fact, more general theories of processes. Whilst the specific result that we present takes its inspiration from the field of *categorical quantum mechanics* (a research area that is concerned with representing fundamental structures of quantum foundations and quantum computing in category-theoretic terms, see e.g. [1], [12], [36], [37], [24], [22] and the forthcoming book [15]) our technical results make no use of many of the structures typically relied upon within this field and hence has much broader applicability.

The technical core of this paper is both a strengthening and generalisation of a theorem by Heunen, Kissinger and Selinger [26], which concerns exploring correspondences between different manners of encoding classicality within categorical quantum mechanics, respectively by means of biproducts [33], certain Frobenius algebras [17], [16], [13], and dagger idempotents [34]. Our strengthening/generalisation now allows for a clear physical interpretation which applies to any theory described by a category.

Our starting point is indeed the fact that physical, computational, and many other theories can very generally be described by (monoidal) categories. Examples include categorical logic [27], categorical programming language semantics [2], and more recently, categorical quantum mechanics; this paper follows the spirit of these process-based conceptions of categories. More specifically, we think of any (monoidal) category as a candidate theory of physical systems (cf. objects) and processes (cf. morphisms).

When viewing morphisms as quantum processes, two universal constructions provide two roads to classicality, respectively embodying a generalisation of mixing and of decoherence. Firstly, it's easily seen that one may represent mixing in a category $\mathcal{C}$ by means of sum-enrichment. Then, when $\mathcal{C}$ is monoidal, endomorphisms $s_i \colon I \to I$ of the tensor unit (i.e. *scalars*) allow one to form weighted mixtures of morphism generalising the probabilistic mixtures appearing in information theory.

On the other hand, decoherence, which in the quantum formalism is an idempotent that sets all off-diagonal entries of a density matrix to 0, is generalised to any idempotent. That this generalisation makes sense follows from the fact that any idempotent can arise from leaking some information into the environment [32]; we formally introduce these *leaks* in Section VI. In the case of quantum theory, by considering more general idempotents, one not only recovers classical theory, but also intermediate ones described by C* algebras, and, remarkably, C* algebras only.

Each of these manifestations of classicality can be used to construct new systems to describe classical data. These are perfectly embodied by two standard universal constructions for categories $\mathcal{C}$, namely the *biproduct completion* $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ [28] and the *Karoubi envelope* $\mathsf{Split}(\mathcal{C})$ [5] (i.e. splitting of all idempotents or *Cauchy completion*). The biproduct completion —corresponding to the case of mixing— generates classical set-like systems with the biproduct playing the role of the set-union, whilst the Karoubi envelope —corresponding to the case of decoherence— generates systems equipped with a decoherence map which 'classicise' their processes.

In a diagram we have:



We investigate when the arrow at the bottom exists (Theorem III.14), and when it is an equivalence (Corollary III.16, and then show that quantum theory indeed satisfies the conditions for the two constructions to be equivalent (Corollary IV.4).

In establishing this result, we strengthen the theorem in [26] by removing the assumption that the idempotents are self-adjoint, and generalise their result beyond the generalised C*-algebraic setting of [35] (i.e. certain Frobenius algebras in dagger compact categories). Therefore we do not need to assume compact nor dagger structure, and in fact, not even monoidal structure; it is a straightforward corollary that our

result respects the monoidal structure when present. While the passage from self-adjoint idempotents to general idempotents might seem minor, it is precisely this relaxation that allows for a clear interpretation.

There was a third road in [26] sandwiched between the two others, directly corresponding to the aforementioned generalised C*-algebras. This sandwich of course still exists in our case, and this leads to another interesting interpretation of our result. Namely that, as already hinted at above, a structure much weaker than the full-blown axiomatization suffices to capture all finite dimensional C*-algebras. Moreover this weaker structure has a very clear interpretation as resulting from leakage (cf. Section VI); two extremes are the fully quantum C*-algebra which corresponds to minimal leakage, while the fully classical C*-algebra corresponds to maximal leakage. Hence, from a physical perspective, the additional structure of C*-algebras is merely an artefact of the Hilbert space representation.

This work is related to and draws on several earlier works. In particular, Corollary III.16 draws on a result of Blume-Kohout et al. [4], and our approach can be seen as a generalisation of that of Selinger and collaborators [34], [26] as discussed in depth in Section VII.

II. Setup

Physical theories can be described as categories where we think of the objects in a category as (physical) *systems*, of the morphisms as *processes*, and $\circ$ as sequential composition of these processes[1]. For all of the categories in this paper we assume that there is a chosen object to represent 'nothing', denoted I. We call morphisms $a\colon I \to A$ *states*, $e\colon A \to I$ *effects*, and $s\colon I \to I$ *scalars*.

Admittedly, this terminology is slightly abusive unless we take I to be the tensor unit in a monoidal category. In such a case, where we think of the tensor product $\otimes$ as *parallel composition* of processes, we can introduce or remove the 'nothing'-object at will via the natural isomorphisms:

$$A \xrightarrow{\lambda_A^{-1}}_{\sim} I \otimes A \xrightarrow[\sim]{\lambda_A} A \qquad A \xrightarrow{\rho_A^{-1}}_{\sim} A \otimes I \xrightarrow[\sim]{\rho_A} A$$

It is only then that states/effects acquire their usual meaning, and scalars behave as expected, in particular, inducing a scalar multiplication (see below). Most of our examples will indeed be monoidal categories, however, our main results will not require I to be the monoidal unit, and holds for general categories. But importantly, they are entirely compatible with the monoidal structure should it exist (see Section III-D).

Before getting to the results however, we cast quantum processes categorically. Throughout we will call a process an *event* when we think of it as forming a part of a probabilistic process (e.g. the occurrence of a particular outcome in a quantum measurement). For a complete categorical description of quantum theory – including how collections of events form more general processes – see [15].

[1] Indeed we will use the terms category/morphism/object and theory/process/system interchangeably throughout.

Example II.1 (Pure quantum events). These can be described by a category $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$ where the objects are finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$ and morphisms are linear maps identified up to a global phase (i.e. $f \sim g \iff f = e^{i\theta} g$ for some θ). The monoidal product is the standard Hilbert space tensor product and the monoidal unit is $\mathbb{C}$. States are therefore vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ up to a phase, and effects dual-vectors again up to a phase. Scalars are complex numbers up to a phase and so are positive real numbers, which we think of as probabilistic weights if ≤ 1.

Two important structures are lacking in this theory of pure quantum events, namely *discarding* and *mixing*. These are important for quantum theory generally, and moreover, correspond to the two roads to classicality that this paper is concerned with. As such, we will now discuss each of them, their interpretation, how they relate, and their role in quantum theory. We first discuss the former.

Definition II.2. A *category with discarding* $(\mathcal{C}, \blacktriangledown)$ is a category coming with a chosen object I and family of morphisms $\blacktriangledown_A\colon A \to I$, with $\blacktriangledown_I = \mathrm{id}_I$.

Of course, again, in order for discarding to get its intended meaning I needs to be the tensor unit. Surprisingly a discarding structure, which merely consists of some distinguished effects, allows one to express causality of processes.

Definition II.3. A morphism $f\colon A \to B$ is *causal* when

$$\blacktriangledown_B \circ f = \blacktriangledown_A \tag{1}$$

The reason why the term causality is justified is that when restricting to causal processes, a (monoidal) theory is non-signalling [11]. Hence compatibility with relativity theory boils down to the requirement that all effects are causal and hence equal to the discarding effect; this notion of causality was first introduced in [7]. However, in the form (1) causality has a very lucid interpretation: whether we discard an object before or after applying some process is irrelevant, either way the result is the same—the object ends up discarded [14], [15]. This guarantees that processes outside the direct surroundings of an experiment can be ignored, and hence is vital to even be able to perform any kind of scientific experiment without, for example, intervention from another galaxy.

We now move on to generalised mixing.

Definition II.4. A category $\mathcal{C}$ is *semi-additive* when it is enriched in the category $\mathbf{CMon}$ of commutative monoids. That is, each homset forms a commutative monoid $(\mathcal{C}(A,B), +, 0)$, with $+$ and 0 preserved by composition. In particular, $\mathcal{C}$ has a family of *zero morphisms*

$$A \xrightarrow{0 = 0_{A,B}} B$$

for $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, satisfying

$$0 \circ f = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad g \circ 0 = 0$$

for all morphisms f, g. In a semi-additive category we often write $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i$ for $f_1 + \cdots + f_n$.

We use the term mixing here as in quantum theory it is precisely this semi-additive structure that allows one to discuss probabilistic mixtures of processes. More generally, in any monoidal category where the scalars $s\colon I \to I$ can be interpreted as probabilities, we may discuss probabilistic weightings of processes:

$$s \cdot f := \left(\; A \xrightarrow{\lambda_A^{-1}}_{\sim} I \otimes A \xrightarrow{s \otimes f} I \otimes B \xrightarrow{\lambda_B}_{\sim} B \; \right)$$

and hence probabilistic mixtures of processes as:

$$\sum_i s_i \cdot f_i$$

If $\sum_i s_i = 1$ then $\{s_i\}$ is a interpreted as a normalised probability distribution, and then any such mixing of causal processes will again be causal.

Remark II.5. Semi-additive structure most often requires non-causal processes. Moreover, probabilistic weights themselves are non-causal, except for the unique causal scalar 1. 'Sub-causal' processes (see Section III-F) can be interpreted as those which do not happen with certainty, but occur as one potential outcome with some probability, while more general processes lack such an interpretation, but are added for mathematical convenience, namely, such that $+$ is a total function.

We now consider the role that these two structures play in quantum theory.

Example II.6 (Quantum events). These can be modelled as a category $\mathbf{Quant}$ which has the same objects and monoidal product as $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$. Note that the bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ define an ordered real vector space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with associated positive cone $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+$. Morphisms between these are then defined as linear order-preserving maps $f\colon \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$ which moreover are completely positive, that is:

$$f \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})^+) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}' \otimes \mathcal{K})^+$$

for all objects $\mathcal{K}$. The semi-additive structure is defined as the usual addition of linear maps. States therefore correspond to $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^+$ (i.e. are density matrices), effects can be written in terms of states via the trace inner product:

$$\langle \rho, _ \rangle = \mathrm{tr}(\rho _)$$

(i.e. are POVM elements) and scalars are positive real numbers. The discarding effect is given by $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbb{I} _)$ and so causality implies that states have trace 1 and general morphisms are trace preserving (i.e. are CPTP maps). This category can also be defined in terms of Selinger's CPM construction [33], which we will return to in Section VII-B. Processes $f \in \mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ can be embedded in $\mathbf{Quant}$ as:

$$f \circ - \circ f^\dagger : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}')$$

Remark II.7. In addition to the case already made in Remark II.5 for considering non-causal processes, note also that the quantum events of Example II.6 typically won't be causal. The causal ones are the trace-preserving maps, and hence, for example, there are no causal effects [14], [15] aside from the discarding effect itself. However, several non-causal events bunched together as a probabilistic process can be causal e.g. quantum measurements. It is therefore very useful to have non-causal processes around, since one does want to be able to talk about 'what just happened'.

The relationship between $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$ and $\mathbf{Quant}$ as described in the above example can be viewed in two different ways. Firstly note that $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$ is a subcategory of $\mathbf{Quant}$ and then it is a standard result in quantum information that there are two equivalent ways to write any general quantum transformation $f\colon A \to B$ in terms of processes in $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$, firstly, via the Kraus decomposition, as a sum of pure transformations, $\{a_k\colon A \to B\}$:

$$f = \sum_k a_k$$

and secondly, via Stinespring dilation, as a pure process $g : A \to B \otimes C$ with an extra output C which is discarded:

$$f = \rho_B \circ (\mathrm{id}_B \otimes \blacksquare_C) \circ g$$

where ρ_B is the monoidal coherence isomorphism. Therefore all of the processes of $\mathbf{Quant}$ can be obtained from those in $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$ either by means of the semi-additive or discarding structure.

This provides both an 'internal' and 'external' view on the origins of general quantum transformations, and it is these two viewpoints that we extend within this paper. This is an important feature of quantum theory, for example, the fact that any mixed state can be represented as a pure bipartite state where one part is discarded is known as the *purification* postulate [7] and has been used as an axiom in reconstructing quantum theory [8]. More generally, the CPM construction provides a recipe for producing categories with discarding and a form of purification, see Section VII-B.

Here are some other example theories which serve as useful points of comparison for quantum theory.

Example II.8 (Probabilistic classical events). These can be modelled in the category $\mathbf{Class}$, objects are natural numbers n, and morphisms $f\colon n \to m$ are $n \times m$ matrices with positive real entries. The monoidal unit is 1 and the monoidal product is $n \otimes m = nm$. Semi-additive structure is provided by the matrix sum. States are therefore column vectors with positive real elements, effects are row vectors and scalars are positive real numbers. The discarding effects are those of the form $(1, 1, ..., 1)$ such that causal states are normalised probability distributions over a finite set and general causal morphisms are stochastic matrices.

Example II.9 (Possibilistic classical events). These can be modelled in the symmetric monoidal category $\mathbf{Rel}$ of sets and relations. Here objects are sets $A, B, \ldots$, morphisms $R\colon A \to B$ are relations from A to B, i.e. subsets $R \subseteq A \times B$, sequential

composition of relations $R\colon A \to B$ and $S\colon B \to C$ is defined by:

$$S \circ R = \{(a, c) \in A \times C \mid R(a, b) \wedge S(b, c)\}$$

and parallel composition is the set-theoretic product:

$$A \otimes B = A \times B$$

so that the monoidal unit is given by the singleton set $I = \{\star\}$. In particular, the scalars $s\colon I \to I$ are the Booleans $\{0, 1\}$. $\mathbf{Rel}$ has discarding, with $\top_A\colon A \to I$ given by the unique relation with $a \mapsto \star$ for all $a \in A$. Hence, causal relations $R\colon A \to B$ are those satisfying $\forall a\ \exists b\ R(a, b)$. This theory is also semi-additive under the union of relations

$$R + S := R \vee S$$

Example II.10 (Modal quantum events). The events in modal quantum theories [30], [31] can be modelled in the symmetric monoidal category where the objects are lattices of subspaces of finite dimensional vector spaces over a particular finite field $\mathbb{Z}_p$, where the choice of field defines a particular modal theory $\mathbf{Modal}_p$. Morphisms are $\vee$ and $\perp$ preserving maps between these lattices. The monoidal product is inherited from the tensor product of the underlying vector spaces. The monoidal unit is the lattice of subspaces of a 1D vector space which gives two scalars 0 and 1 interpreted as impossible and possible respectively. The 0 scalar allows us to define zero-morphisms

$$0_{AB} := 0 \cdot f_{AB}$$

The discarding effect $\top_A\colon A \to I$ can then be defined by:

$$\top_A \circ a = 0 \iff a = 0_{IA}$$

where $a\colon I \to A$. This is again a semi-additive category with $f \vee g$ defined by:

$$(f \vee g) \circ a := (f \circ a) \vee (g \circ a)$$

for all $a\colon I \to A$.

Remark II.11. In fact, $\mathbf{Rel}$ can be viewed as $\mathbf{Modal}_p$ for the case '$p = 1$' in a certain precise sense [19].

Example II.12. Any semi-ring $(R, +, 0, 1)$ forms a one object, semi-additive discard category, with $\top = 1$.

III. The Two Roads

We now introduce the two constructions which adjoin classicality to a theory. The first follows an external perspective, describing how one may build mixtures of the existing objects of the theory. The second follows the internal perspective, and shows how classicality can emerge due to restrictions arising from decoherence. We then derive when these two constructions coincide.

A. The biproduct completion

The first of these approaches is captured by a standard notion from category theory. Recall that, in any semi-additive category, a *biproduct* of a finite collection $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of objects consists of an object $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i$ and morphisms:

$$A_i \xrightarrow{\kappa_i} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n A_i \xrightarrow{\pi_j} A_j$$

satisfying:

$$\pi_i \circ \kappa_j = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j \qquad \pi_i \circ \kappa_i = \mathrm{id}_{A_i} \tag{2}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_i \circ \kappa_i = \mathrm{id}_A \tag{3}$$

This makes A both a product and coproduct of the objects $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$. An empty biproduct is the same as a *zero object* —an object 0 which is both initial and terminal.

We will require the biproducts we consider to also respect any discarding structure which is present:

Definition III.1. In a category with discarding a biproduct is *causal* when each of its structural morphisms κ_i is causal.

In contrast, the structural morphisms π_i will usually not be causal. Note that a semi-additive category has finite (causal) biproducts whenever it has (causal) biproducts of pairs of objects as well as a zero object.

Examples III.2. $\mathbf{Class}$ and $\mathbf{Rel}$ each have causal biproducts, given by the direct sum of vector spaces and disjoint union of sets, respectively.

Example III.3. Any *grounded biproduct category* in the sense of Cho, Jacobs and Westerbaan (×2) [9] is a semi-additive category with discarding and causal biproducts.

We may now describe the first universal construction of our study.

Definition III.4 (Biproduct completion). Any semi-additive category $\mathcal{C}$ may be embedded universally into one with biproducts $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$, its *free biproduct completion* (see [28, Exercise VIII.2.6]). The objects of $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ are finite lists $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle$ of objects from $\mathcal{C}$, with the empty list forming a zero object. Morphisms

$$M\colon \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \to \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle$$

are matrices of morphisms

$$\langle M_{i,j}\colon A_i \to B_j\rangle,$$

and composition is the usual one of matrices. The identity on $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle$ is the matrix with identities on its diagonal entries and zeroes elsewhere.

There is a canonical full and faithful embedding of semi-additive categories $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ given by $A \mapsto \langle A\rangle$. Moreover, this is universal in that any semi-additive functor $F\colon \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ from $\mathcal{C}$ to a semi-additive category $\mathcal{E}$ with biproducts lifts to one $\hat{F}\colon \mathcal{C}^{\oplus} \to \mathcal{E}$, unique up to natural isomorphism.

Example III.5. Generalising Example II.8, the biproduct completion of a semi-ring R, viewed as a one-object category, is the category $\mathbf{Mat}_R$ of R-valued matrices. Explicitly, objects are natural numbers n and morphisms $M\colon n \to m$ are matrices with values in R, with their usual identity, composition and addition. In particular $\mathbf{Class} = \mathbf{Mat}_{\mathbb{R}^+}$, while the category $\mathbf{Mat}_{\mathbb{B}}$ of Boolean valued matrices is equivalent to $\mathbf{FRel}$, the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Rel}$ on finite sets.

When $\mathcal{C}$ is a category with discarding, $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ is again one under $I = \langle I \rangle$ and $\discard_{\langle A_1,\dots,A_n\rangle} = \langle \discard_{A_i}\colon A_i \to I\rangle_{i=1}^{n}$. To state its universal property, we will need to consider functors and natural transformations preserving the discarding structure:

Definition III.6. A functor $F\colon (\mathcal{C},\discard) \to (\mathcal{D},\discard)$ between categories with discarding is *causal* when $\discard_{F(I)}\colon F(I) \to I$ is an isomorphism and $F(\discard_A) = \discard_{F(I)} \circ F(\discard_A)$ for all objects A. A natural transformation is *causal* when all of its components are.

In particular, the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ is causal, with the same universal property as before when restricted to causal biproducts, functors and natural transformations.

B. Splitting idempotents

Following our consideration of mixing, we now turn to decoherence, we capture this with the following categorical concept. Recall that, in any category, an *idempotent* on an object A is a morphism $p\colon A \to A$ satisfying $p \circ p = p$. An idempotent *splits* when it decomposes as

$$p = m \circ e$$

for a pair of morphisms $e\colon A \to B$, $m\colon B \to A$, with

$$e \circ m = \mathrm{id}_B$$

We then denote the splitting pair by (m, e). Conversely, for any such pair of morphisms, $m \circ e$ is always an idempotent on A.

Definition III.7. In a category with discarding, an idempotent splits *causally* when it has a splitting (m, e) with m causal.

Splittings for idempotents may in fact always be added in a free way, through our second construction of interest.

Definition III.8 (Karoubi Envelope). Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category. The *Karoubi Envelope* $\mathsf{Split}(\mathcal{C})$ of $\mathcal{C}$ is the following category ([5], see also [34]). Objects are pairs (A, p) where $p\colon A \to A$ is an idempotent. Morphisms $f\colon (A, p) \to (B, q)$ are morphisms $f\colon A \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying

$$f = q \circ f \circ p$$

In particular, the identity on (A, p) is p.

When $\mathcal{C}$ has discarding so does $\mathsf{Split}(\mathcal{C})$, with

$$\discard_{(A,p)} = \discard \circ p\colon (A, p) \to (I, \mathrm{id})$$

In this case the causal idempotents are the most physically interesting, and we write $\mathsf{Split}^{\discard}(\mathcal{C})$ for the full subcategory on objects (A, p) with p causal. If $\mathcal{C}$ is semi-additive then so is $\mathsf{Split}^{(\discard)}(\mathcal{C})$, with addition lifted from $\mathcal{C}$. The key property of the construction is as follows: there is a full (causal) embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Split}^{(\discard)}(\mathcal{C})$ given by $A \mapsto (A, \mathrm{id})$, which gives every (causal) idempotent in $\mathcal{C}$ a (causal) splitting in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\discard)}(\mathcal{C})$. As before, $\mathsf{Split}^{(\discard)}(\mathcal{C})$ is universal with this property.

Remark III.9. We may interpret the $\mathsf{Split}(\mathcal{C})$ construction as introducing new objects by imposing a fundamental restriction on the allowed morphisms, (i.e. those satisfying $f = q \circ f \circ p$) in Section VI we discuss how such a restriction can arise due to 'leaking' information.

C. Comparing the constructions

We have met two ways to freely extend our category $\mathcal{C}$ to include classical-like systems, $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ and $\mathsf{Split}^{\discard}(\mathcal{C})$, motivated through mixing and decoherence, respectively. It is natural to ask what the relationship is between these constructions, and when they coincide. In this Section we in fact answer this question for both $\mathsf{Split}^{\discard}(\mathcal{C})$ and the more generally definable $\mathsf{Split}(\mathcal{C})$ simultaneously.

We will require the following weakening of the notion of a biproduct:

Definition III.10. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category with zero morphisms. A *disjoint embedding* of a finite collection of objects $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ is given by an object A and morphisms:

$$A_i \xrightarrow{\kappa_i} A \xrightarrow{\pi_j} A_j$$

satisfying the first collection of biproduct equations (2). When $\mathcal{C}$ is semi-additive, the morphism $p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_i \circ \pi_i$ is then an idempotent on A. When $\mathcal{C}$ also has discarding, a *causal* disjoint embedding is one for which the morphisms p and κ_i are all causal.

In particular, an empty (causal) disjoint embedding is just an object of the form $(A, 0)$ in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\discard)}(\mathcal{C})$. Note that in general a disjoint embedding is not necessarily a biproduct in $\mathcal{C}$, since it may fail to satisfy (3).

Example III.11. Any (causal) biproduct is in particular a (causal) disjoint embedding. Hence they are present in our examples $\mathbf{Class}$, $\mathbf{Rel}$ and $\mathbf{Mat}_R$.

Example III.12. A motivating example is $\mathbf{Quant}$, which has disjoint embeddings which are not biproducts.

Given a collection of (finite-dimensional) Hilbert spaces $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}_i$, we may form their Hilbert space direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_i$, which is their biproduct in the category $\mathbf{FHilb}$ of (finite-dimensional) Hilbert spaces and continuous linear maps. However this is no longer a biproduct of the $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}_i$ in $\mathbf{Quant}$, where linear maps from $\mathbf{FHilb}$ are identified up to global phase, but only a disjoint embedding. Physically, the distinction is that the addition in $\mathbf{FHilb}$ is given by superposition, while that of $\mathbf{Quant}$ refers to mixing. This example generalises to categories of the form $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$, see Proposition VII.3 later.

Remark III.13. Disjoint embeddings can be understood as a property of our theory allowing for the encoding of classical data. Concretely, they provide the ability to store any collection of systems in a disjoint way in some larger system. In particular, by forming a disjoint embedding C of n copies of I we may store an n-level classical system in C. However, the choice of C is non-canonical: there can be many which need not be isomorphic.

Abstractly, the significance of disjoint embeddings is the following.

Theorem III.14. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be semi-additive (with discarding). Then $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$ has finite (causal) biproducts iff $\mathcal{C}$ has (causal) disjoint embeddings.

Proof: We have already seen that $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$ is semi-additive, so the statement makes sense. Expanding the definitions shows that a (causal) disjoint embedding is precisely a (causal) biproduct of the form $(A, p) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n}(A_i, \mathrm{id})$ in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$. Hence the conditions are clearly necessary. It's easy to see that an empty (causal) disjoint embedding $(A, 0)$ is a zero object in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$, so it suffices to check this category has binary (causal) biproducts.

Now for any pair of objects (A_1, p_1), (A_2, p_2) in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$, by assumption the objects A_1 A_2 have a (causal) disjoint embedding (A, p), with morphisms $\kappa_i \colon A_i \to A$ and $\pi_j \colon A \to A_j$. Then $q = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \kappa_i \circ p_i \circ \pi_i$ is a (causal) idempotent on A. Further, it is easy to check that $\kappa_i \circ p_i \colon (A_i, p_i) \to (A, q)$ and $p_i \circ \pi_i \colon (A, q) \to (A_i, p_i)$ are well-defined morphisms in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$ making (A, q) a (causal) biproduct $(A_1, p_1) \oplus (A_2, p_2)$. ∎

Observe that the idempotents which arise from disjoint embeddings are precisely those with the following special property.

Definition III.15. An idempotent $p \colon A \to A$ has a *finite decomposition* when it may be written as a finite sum:

$$p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \circ e_i$$

of split idempotents $p_i = m_i \circ e_i$ for which $p_i \circ p_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Such a decomposition is *causal* when all of the morphisms m_i are causal.

We are now able to determine when our two constructions of interest coincide (cf. [34, Corollary 4.7]).

Corollary III.16. When $\mathcal{C}$ has (causal) disjoint embeddings, there is a full, semi-additive (causal) embedding $F \colon \mathcal{C}^{\oplus} \to \mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$.

Further, the following are equivalent:

1. F is a (causal) equivalence of categories;
2. every (causal) idempotent splits (causally) in $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$;
3. every (causal) idempotent in $\mathcal{C}$ has a (causal) finite decomposition.

When these hold we say $\mathcal{C}$ has the *finite decomposition property*.

Proof: To see that F exists, apply the universal property of $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ to the (causal) embedding $\mathcal{C} \to \mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$, using Proposition III.14.Concretely, F acts on objects by $(A_1, \cdots, A_n) \mapsto \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n}(A_i, \mathrm{id})$.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$. Since F is a (causal) equivalence and (causal) idempotents split (causally) in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$, they do in $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$. It's easy to see that a (causal) idempotent $p \colon A \to A$ splits (causally) over $(A_i)_{i=1}^{n}$ in $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ iff it has a (causal) finite decomposition $p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ with each p_i splitting over A_i.

$3 \iff 1$. By construction, F is (causally) essentially surjective on objects iff every object (A, p) forms a (causal) biproduct $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n}(A_i, \mathrm{id}_{A_i})$ in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$. By definition, this holds iff every p has a (causal) finite decomposition. ∎

Example III.17. When $\mathcal{C}$ already has biproducts the embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ is an equivalence, and Corollary III.16 amounts to the fact that any finitely decomposable idempotent $p = p_1 + \cdots + p_n$ in $\mathcal{C}$ already splits over $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} A_i$, where p_i splits over A_i, for each i.

Before turning to the key example of quantum theory we consider first some abstract results which hold for the case of quantum theory and will be useful for the proof.

D. Compatibility with monoidal structure

Physically theories are often presented in terms of categories with additional monoidal structure. Our approach and results are all compatible with monoidal structure whenever it is present, in a straightforward manner. Let us spell this out more explicitly:

- a *(symmetric) monoidal category with discarding* $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top)$ is a (symmetric) monoidal category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, I)$ which is also a category with discarding $(\mathcal{C}, \top, I)$ with I being the monoidal unit, for which all coherence isomorphisms are causal, and for which for all objects A, B we have:
$$\top_{A \otimes B} = \lambda_I \circ (\top_A \otimes \top_B)$$
where $\lambda_I \colon I \otimes I \to I$ is the coherence isomorphism.
- a *causal* (symmetric) monoidal functor $F \colon (\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \top) \to (\mathcal{D}, \otimes, \top)$ is a causal functor which is also strong (symmetric) monoidal, with each of its structure isomorphisms $F(A) \otimes F(B) \simeq F(A \otimes B)$ and $I \simeq F(I)$ being causal.
- A *semi-additive monoidal category* is a monoidal category which is monoidally enriched in $\mathbf{CMon}$. Explicitly, it is semi-additive and also satisfies:
$$f \otimes (g + h) = f \otimes g + f \otimes h$$
$$(f + g) \otimes h = f \otimes h + g \otimes h$$
$$f \otimes 0 = 0 = 0 \otimes g$$
for all morphisms f, g, h.

Then it is straightforward to check that when $\mathcal{C}$ is a semi-additive (symmetric) monoidal category (with discarding) so are each of $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ and $\mathsf{Split}^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{C})$, and they satisfy the same universal properties with respect to such categories and (causal, symmetric) monoidal semi-additive functors and

(causal) monoidal natural transformations between them. In particular, the functors and equivalences of Corollary III.16 are now monoidal ones.

E. Idempotents in well-pointed categories

In a categories coming with an obvious notion of the pointwise image of a morphism, there is a useful criterion to determine when an idempotent splits, which will be helpful when we turn to quantum theory in Section IV. Recall that a *well-pointed category* $(\mathcal{C}, I)$ is a category along with a distinguished object I such that for all $f, g\colon A \to B$ with $f \circ x = g \circ x$ for all $x\colon I \to A$, we have $f = g$. For any morphism $f\colon A \to B$ we then define

$$\mathrm{Im}(f) = \{f \circ a \mid a\colon I \to A\}$$

Example III.18. All of the categories with discarding $\mathbf{Quant}$, $\mathbf{Class}$, $\mathbf{Rel}$, $\mathbf{Mat}_R$ are well-pointed over their usual object I. *Real quantum theory* provides an interesting physical example of a non-well-pointed category [25].

Lemma III.19. Let $p, q\colon A \to A$ be (causal) idempotents in a well-pointed category $(\mathcal{C}, I)$, with $\mathrm{Im}(p) = \mathrm{Im}(q)$. Then p splits (causally) iff q does, and p has a (causal) finite decomposition iff q does.

Proof: For all $x\colon I \to A$ we have $p \circ q \circ x = p \circ p \circ y = p \circ y = q \circ x$ for some $y\colon I \to A$. Hence by well-pointedness we have $p \circ q = q$, and dually $q \circ p = p$ also. This states precisely that (A, p) and (A, q) are (causally) isomorphic in $\mathsf{Split}^{(\clubsuit)}(\mathcal{C})$. Then p has a (causal) finite decomposition iff it forms a (causal) biproduct $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n}(A_i, \mathrm{id})$, iff q does. In particular, taking $i = 1$ shows that p splits (causally) precisely when q does. ∎

F. Sub-causal idempotents

For many theories, including quantum theory and our other probabilistic examples, the existence of splittings of causal idempotents in fact suffices to ensure the splitting of a more general class (c.f. Remark II.5).

Definition III.20. A process $f\colon A \to B$ is *sub-causal* when there is some $x\colon A \to I$ with

$$(\clubsuit \circ f) + x = \clubsuit$$

Examples III.21. Any causal process is in particular sub-causal. In $\mathbf{Quant}$, a process is sub-causal when it is trace non-increasing. A sub-causal process in $\mathbf{Class}$ is a sub-stochastic matrix, i.e. one whose columns have sum bounded by 1. In $\mathbf{Rel}$ and $\mathbf{Modal}_p$ every process is sub-causal.

Proposition III.22. Consider a semi-additive category with discarding $(\mathcal{C}, \clubsuit, I, +)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies:

- Cancellativity: $f + g = f + h \implies g = h$;
- For every non-zero $f\colon A \to B$ there exists a state ρ of A with $\clubsuit \circ f \circ a = \mathrm{id}_I$.

If causal idempotents causally split in $\mathcal{C}$, so do (non-zero) sub-causal idempotents.

Proof: Let $p\colon A \to A$ be a non-zero sub-causal idempotent, with $(\clubsuit \circ p) + x = \clubsuit$. Note that:

$$\clubsuit \circ p = (\clubsuit \circ p + x) \circ p = (\clubsuit \circ p) + (x \circ p)$$

and so by cancellativity $x \circ p = 0$. By assumption there is some state a of A with $\clubsuit \circ p \circ a = 1$. We then define a new idempotent on A by $q = p + (p \circ a \circ x)$. One may then check that q is indeed idempotent, causal, and further satisfies $p \circ q = q$ and $q \circ p = p$. These ensure that if q has splitting (m, e) then p has splitting $(m, e \circ p)$. ∎

IV. Quantum theory

We now turn to the main result of this paper, that is, that for the example of quantum theory that the two constructions coincide, both leading to the category of finite dimensional C*-algebras.

Recall that a *C*-algebra* is a Banach algebra $(A, \|_\|)$ over $\mathbb{C}$ with an involution $(-)^*$ compatible with complex conjugation, and which satisfies $\|A^*A\| = \|A^*\|\|A\|$ for all elements A. Specifically, we are concerned here with finite-dimensional C*-algebras, which are of most interest for quantum information theory. These form a symmetric monoidal category as we now describe.

Example IV.1 (C* algebras). In the category $\mathbf{CStar}$ objects are finite dimensional C*-algebras and morphisms completely positive linear maps (in the same sense as defined for $\mathbf{Quant}$). The monoidal product is the standard C*-algebraic tensor product and the monoidal unit is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C})$. Semi-additive structure is provided by the standard sum of linear maps. Discarding effects are provided by the trace, and biproducts by the direct sum of C*-algebras.

Note that $\mathbf{Quant}$ and $\mathbf{Class}$ are each equivalent to full subcategories of $\mathbf{CStar}$, corresponding to C*-algebras of the form $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, and the commutative C*-algebras, respectively. These subcategories can also be characterised in terms of leaks, see Section VI.

Moreover, in the finite dimensional case, there is a well known classification result [6] stating that any finite dimensional C*-algebra is isomorphic to the direct sum of complex matrix algebras. It is therefore unsurprising that our first road, the biproduct completion, leads to this category.

Example IV.2. $\mathbf{CStar}$ is the biproduct completion of $\mathbf{Quant}$. See [26, Example 3.4.] for the details.

The second road, however, requires some more work.

Proposition IV.3. $\mathbf{Quant}$ has the finite decomposition property.

Proof: We saw in Example III.12 that $\mathbf{Quant}$ has causal disjoint embeddings. Now let $p \in \mathbf{Quant}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$ be a causal idempotent. Then p is an idempotent, trace-preserving, completely positive linear map on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. By [4, Theorem 5], there is a decomposition $\mathcal{H} \simeq \bigoplus_k A_k \otimes B_k$ and set of positive

semidefinite matrices τ_K on B_k with:

$$p(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})) = \left\{ \sum_k M_{A_k} \otimes \tau_k \colon M_{A_k} \in \mathcal{B}(A_k) \right\}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\tau_k \neq 0$ and so $\mathrm{Tr}(\tau_k) \neq 0$, for all k. Then $p(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})) = q(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$ for the causally finitely decomposable idempotent $q = \sum_{k \in K} m_k \circ e_k$, where $m_k \colon \mathcal{B}(A_k) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by $M \mapsto (1/\mathrm{Tr}(\tau_k))M \otimes \tau_k$, and $e_k \colon \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(A_k)$ is given by $M \mapsto M|_{A_k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{B_k}(\mathrm{Tr}_{A_j \otimes B_j, j \neq k}(M))$.

Since states $\rho \in \mathbf{Quant}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{H})$ may be viewed as elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, on which p is an idempotent map, this gives that $\mathrm{Im}(p) = \mathrm{Im}(q)$ in the well-pointed category $(\mathbf{Quant}, \mathbb{C})$. Hence by Lemma III.19, since q has a causal finite decomposition, so does p. ∎

We have reached our main result:

Corollary IV.4. There is a monoidal, causal equivalence:

$$\mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{Quant}) \simeq \mathbf{CStar} \simeq \mathbf{Quant}^{\oplus}$$

Proof: Combine Example IV.2, Proposition IV.3 and Corollary III.16. ∎

Remark IV.5. We have shown that all causal (trace-preserving) idempotents causally split in $\mathbf{CStar}$. By Proposition III.22, the same in fact holds for all idempotents which are sub-causal, *i.e.* trace-non increasing. However, it remains an open question whether all idempotents split.

The fact that these two constructions coincide, given their unrelated physical motivation and entirely distinct mathematical description, is a surprising feature of quantum theory. In the following Section we consider whether this is also true for other theories of interest or whether this is a feature special to quantum theory.

V. Further Examples

A. Classical probability theory

Another example in which both constructions coincide is provided by classical probability theory, since in fact there are (monoidal, causal) equivalences:

$$\mathbf{Class}^{\oplus} \simeq \mathbf{Class} \simeq \mathsf{Split}(\mathbf{Class}) \simeq \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{Class})$$

The left hand equivalence holds since, as we have seen, $\mathbf{Class}$ already has biproducts. Conversely, it follow from a Theorem of Flor ([23, Theorem 2], see also [21, Theorem 4]) that any idempotent p in $\mathbf{Class}$ has a finite decomposition $p = z_1 + \cdots + z_k$ where the z_i satisfy $z_i \circ z_j = \delta_{i,j} z_i$ and each are of rank one, hence splitting over I. In particular, *every* idempotent in $\mathbf{Class}$ has a finite decomposition and so splits, yielding the other equivalences.

B. Possibilistic theories

In contrast, the constructions will generally fail to coincide in theories of a possibilistic nature, such as $\mathbf{Modal}_p$ or $\mathbf{Rel}$. To make this precise, say that a theory is *positive* when $\bar{+} \circ (f + g) = 0 \implies f = g = 0$, for all morphisms f, g. By a *possibilistic* theory we mean a positive one in which the addition $+$ is idempotent, and the scalars $s \colon I \to I$ under $(\circ, +)$ are the Booleans $\{0, 1\}$.

We will consider possibilistic theories with a particular physically motivated property. Call a pair of states $a_0, a_1 \colon I \to A$ on A *perfectly distinguishable* when there exists a pair of effects $\bar{a_0}, \bar{a_1}$ on A with $\bar{a_0} + \bar{a_1} = \bar{+}$ and $\bar{a_i} \circ a_j = \delta_{i,j}$. We say that a theory satisfies *perfect distinguishability* when every system not isomorphic to I or a zero object 0 has a pair of perfectly distinguishable states, and there exists at least one such system. Then we have the following:

Proposition V.1. Any possibilistic theory $(\mathcal{C}, \bar{+})$ with perfect distinguishability lacks the finite decomposition property.

Proof: It is easy to see that the biproduct completion $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ is again a possibilistic theory satisfying perfect distinguishability, and hence it suffices to show that causal idempotents do not split in $\mathcal{C}$. Pick a system A possessing a pair of states $\{a_0, a_1\}$ perfectly distinguishable by some effects $\{\bar{a_0}, \bar{a_1}\}$. Then since $\bar{a_1} + \bar{+} = \bar{+}$, the following defines a causal idempotent on A:

$$p = a_0 \circ \bar{+} + a_1 \circ \bar{a_1} \tag{4}$$

Suppose $p \colon A \to A$ has a splitting (m, e) over an object B. Next suppose B has two perfectly distinguishable states b_0, b_1, via the effects $\{\bar{b_0}, \bar{b_1}\}$. We define new states and effects on A by $c_i = m \circ b_i$ and $\bar{c_i} = \bar{b_i} \circ e$, respectively, for $i = 1, 2$. Then:

$$0 = \bar{c_0} \circ c_1 = \bar{c_0} \circ p \circ c_1 = (\bar{c_0} \circ a_0) \circ (\bar{+} \circ c_1) + (\bar{c_0} \circ a_1) \circ (\bar{a_1} \circ c_1)$$

Since the scalars are the Booleans, and the b_i and hence c_i are non-zero, in particular we must have $\bar{c_0} \circ a_0 = 0$. Dually, $\bar{c_1} \circ a_0 = 0$ holds also. But then $\bar{+} \circ e \circ a_0 = (\bar{b_0} + \bar{b_1}) \circ e \circ a_0 = (\bar{c_0} + \bar{c_1}) \circ a_0 = 0$. By positivity, $e \circ a_0 = 0$, and hence $a_0 = p \circ a_0 = m \circ e \circ a_0 = 0$, contradicting $\bar{a_0} \circ a_0 = 1$.

We conclude that no such pair of states exists on B. Since $p \neq 0$, B cannot be a zero object. Hence we must have $B \simeq I$ and so $p = x \circ y$ for some state x and effect y on A, respectively. But then, for any effect z on A, since the scalars are the Booleans we must have either $z \circ p = 0$ or $z \circ p = y$. Hence $\bar{a_1} = \bar{a_1} \circ p = y = \bar{+} \circ p = \bar{+}$, and so $\bar{a_1} \circ a_0 = 1$, a contradiction. ∎

Example V.2. Both $\mathbf{Modal}_p$ and $\mathbf{Rel}$ are possibilistic theories with discarding and perfect distinguishability, and so for these theories the constructions do not coincide.

For example, in $\mathbf{Rel}$, any set A not isomorphic to $I = \{\star\}$ or $0 = \emptyset$ has at least two distinct elements, which then form a pair of perfectly distinguishable states. Hence $\mathbf{Rel}$ lacks the finite decomposition property. Concretely, the causal idempotent (4) is the relation on $\{0, 1\}$ given by $0 \mapsto 0$, $1 \mapsto 0, 1$, which does not split.

C. Information units

It is not just possibilistic models for which these two constructions differ, a somewhat contrived example can be motivated by considering the idea of an information unit

for a theory. An information unit is a particular object U in a theory $\mathcal{C}$ such that any process in the theory can be 'simulated' on an n-fold monoidal product of U. In quantum theory such an information unit is provided by the qubit. The existence of an information unit has been used as a postulate in reconstructing quantum theory [29] and underlies the circuit model of quantum computation.

We define a full subcategory of a theory with an information unit by restricting to objects $\{I, U^{\otimes n}\}$ and denote this subcategory as $\mathcal{C}_{\langle U\rangle}$.

Example V.3. For the quantum case with $U = \mathbb{C}^2$

$$\mathbf{Quant}^{\oplus}_{\langle U\rangle} \subsetneq \mathbf{CStar} \simeq \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{Quant}_{\langle U\rangle})$$

To obtain an arbitrary n-level quantum system by splitting a causal idempotent we can consider m such that $n \leq M := 2^m$ and consider a sub-causal projector onto an n dimensional subspace. We can then use Proposition III.22 to construct a causal idempotent which splits over the same system.

On the other hand is not possible to construct (for example) a qutrit with direct sums or tensor products of qubits and hence the biproduct completion does not give the entirety of $\mathbf{CStar}$.

In fact, this result can be seen as a demonstration that the qubit is indeed an information unit for quantum theory as this provides a way to simulate any other quantum system on some composite of qubits.

VI. Idempotents from leaks

We now show how idempotents naturally arise in arbitrary monoidal theories, from information leakage. Throughout we work in a symmetric monoidal category with discarding $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, \discard)$, as introduced in Section III-D.

Definition VI.1. A *leak* on an object A is a morphism

$$l\colon A \to A \otimes L \tag{5}$$

which has discarding as a right counit, that is:

$$\rho_A \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \discard_L) \circ l = \mathrm{id}_A$$

It straightforwardly follows that all leaks are causal.

Example VI.2. In $\mathbf{Quant}$ all leaks are *constant*, i.e. of the form:

$$(\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \sigma) \circ \rho_A^{-1}$$

for some causal state σ on L.

Example VI.3. A *broadcasting map* [3], [14] on an object A is a leak $l\colon A \to A \otimes A$, *i.e.* with $L = A$, for which discarding is also a left counit. The function $X \to X \times X$ on a set X with $x \mapsto (x, x)$ lifts to a broadcasting map in both of our classical theories $\mathbf{Class}$ and $\mathbf{Rel}$.

Remark VI.4. In fact, minimal leakage characterises quantum theory while maximal leakage characterises classical theory [32]. More precisely, $\mathbf{Quant}$ and $\mathbf{Class}$ are equivalent to the full subcategories of $\mathbf{CStar}$ on objects with only constant leaks, and on objects with maximal leaks, i.e. broadcasting maps, respectively.

It is natural, given any theory $(\mathcal{C}, \discard)$, and for each system A a chosen process:

$$l_A\colon A \to A \otimes L_A$$

to construct a new theory $\mathcal{C}_L$ in which l_A represents the ongoing 'leakage' of that system into the environment. The result of this leakage on A would be the process:

$$\iota_A := \rho_A \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \discard_{L_A}) \circ l_A \tag{6}$$

Processes $A \to B$ in the new theory should then consist of applying the leakage to the input and output of every process $f\colon A \to B$ of our original theory, i.e. of to be of the form:

$$\iota_B \circ f \circ \iota_A$$

To ensure that the resulting theory is indeed a category it suffices for the processes ι_A to be idempotent. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}_L$ is then the full subcategory of $\mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{C})$ given by the objects (A, ι_A). It is again symmetric monoidal with discarding whenever our choice of leakage morphisms l_A ensures that

$$\iota_{A\otimes B} = \iota_A \otimes \iota_B$$

for all systems A, B. In this case, ι_A becomes the identity on A, guaranteeing that l_A provides a leak in the new theory, $[(\iota_A \otimes \iota_{L_A}) \circ l_A \circ \iota_A]$. It is simple to check that this is indeed a leak:

$$\rho_A \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \discard_{L_A}) \circ [(\iota_A \otimes \iota_{L_A}) \circ l_A \circ \iota_A] = \iota_A \circ \iota_A \circ \iota_A = \iota_A$$

Alternately, starting again from $\mathcal{C}$, if we want to obtain a theory which can describe all possible systems that could arise from some leakage then we must instead take systems to be all possible pairs (A, l_A) with the above property, i.e. such that ι_A is idempotent. But this is none other than $\mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, *any* causal idempotent $p\colon A \to A$ is of the form (6) for some l_A, for example by taking

$$l_A := \rho_A^{-1} \circ p\colon A \to A \otimes I$$

This may be shown in a more insightful manner by taking l_A to be any 'purification' of ι_A, that is, any pure process satisfying (6). The existence of such a process is guaranteed in quantum theory by the Stinespring dilation theorem, and more generally for theories arising from the CPM-construction [18], or, those satisfying the purification postulate of [7]. Hence we have generalised the idea that decoherence results from information-leaking, from the specific case of quantum theory to a much broader class of theories.

There is another important conclusion we can draw from idempotents resulting from leaks.

Example VI.5. A result of Vicary [35] states that finite dimensional C*-algebras are precisely *(dagger special) Frobenius structures* in $\mathbf{FHilb}$, that is, comonoids

$$\delta\colon A \to A \otimes A$$

which additionally satisfy (together with their 'daggers', see Section VII below) the *dagger Frobenius law*:

$$(\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \delta^\dagger) \circ \alpha \circ (\delta \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) = (\delta^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}_A) \circ \alpha^{-1} \circ (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \delta)$$

where α is the appropriate coherence isomorphism, and *speciality*:

$$\delta^\dagger \circ \delta = \mathrm{id}_A$$

However, we now know that the much weaker concept of a process

$$l \colon A \to A \otimes L$$

in the directly physically interpretable category $\mathbf{Quant}$, for which ι is a causal idempotent as above, is already sufficient to guarantee the rest of this comonoid structure. Hence, one is tempted to deduce that the essential physical structure of C*-algebras is captured by that of a leak.

VII. Comparison with dagger categorical approaches

Our work bares close similarities with other uses of biproducts and idempotent splittings for the modelling of quantum-classical systems. In particular, both notions are studied in this context by Selinger in [34], while Corollary IV.4 is a strengthening of an existing result of Heunen, Kissinger and Selinger [26]. Crucially, however, these previous approaches have relied on a particular feature of quantum theory not present in general physical theories, namely the existence of a *dagger*.

Recall that a *dagger category* $(\mathcal{C}, \dagger)$ is a category $\mathcal{C}$ coming with an involutive, identity on objects functor $\dagger \colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathcal{C}$. Then a dagger semi-additive category (dagger monoidal category etc.) is one coming with a dagger respecting the additive (monoidal, etc.) structure in a straightforward sense. In particular, a *dagger compact* category is a dagger symmetric monoidal category in which each object A comes with a so-called *dagger dual* object A^* – see [1], [33] for details.

Examples VII.1. $\mathbf{Rel}$, $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$, $\mathbf{Quant}$, $\mathbf{FHilb}$, $\mathbf{Class}$ and $\mathbf{CStar}$ are all dagger compact categories. In $\mathbf{Rel}$ the dagger is given by relational converse, while in the other cases it extends the adjoint of linear maps.

A. Compatibility with dagger structure

While the results of Section III do without daggers, they may be easily be adapted to include them, as follows. In a dagger category, a *dagger idempotent* $p \colon A \to A$ is an idempotent satisfying $p = p^\dagger$, and it has a *dagger* splitting when it splits as (m, e) with $m = e^\dagger$. We write $\mathsf{Split}^\ddagger_\dagger(\mathcal{D})$ for the full subcategory of $\mathsf{Split}^\ddagger(\mathcal{D})$ determined by the causal dagger idempotents. Similarly, a *dagger* disjoint embedding or biproduct $(A, A_i, \kappa_i, \pi_j)$ is one for which $\pi_i = \kappa_i^\dagger$ holds, for all i. Then $\mathcal{D}^\oplus$ and $\mathsf{Split}^\ddagger_\dagger(\mathcal{D})$ satisfy their usual universal properties with respect to functors and natural transformations respecting the dagger. Further, the analogue of Corollary III.16 is now a dagger-respecting equivalence of dagger categories $\mathcal{D}^\oplus \simeq \mathsf{Split}^\ddagger_\dagger(\mathcal{D})$.

B. The CPM construction and environment structures

Given a dagger compact category $\mathcal{C}$ interpreted as consisting of pure processes, we may construct a new one $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$, with the same objects as $\mathcal{C}$, but interpreted as consisting of mixed processes [33]. An axiomatization of the CPM construction which closely resembles our treatment here is provided through the following notion [10], [18]. An *environment structure* $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}, \fatsemi)$ consists of a dagger compact category $\mathcal{D}$ with discarding $\fatsemi$ respecting the dagger compact structure, along with a chosen dagger compact subcategory $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}$ such that:

$$\fatsemi \circ f = \fatsemi \circ g \iff f^\dagger \circ f = g^\dagger \circ g \tag{7}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}$. It satisfies *purification* whenever every morphism in $\mathcal{D}$ is of the form:

$$\lambda \circ (\fatsemi \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ f$$

for some morphism f in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}$. In this case there is a (dagger monoidal) isomorphism of categories

$$\mathcal{D} \simeq \mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}})$$

and conversely every category $\mathcal{D} = \mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$ arises in this way. The key example is the following:

Example VII.2. $\mathbf{Quant}$ and $\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}$ form an environment structure with purification, and we have:

$$\mathbf{Quant} \simeq \mathsf{CPM}(\mathbf{Quant}_{\text{pure}}) \simeq \mathsf{CPM}(\mathbf{FHilb})$$

We have seen that, while $\mathbf{FHilb}$ has biproducts, $\mathbf{Quant}$ merely has disjoint embeddings. In fact, disjoint embeddings in $\mathcal{C}$ suffice to deduce properties of $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$ usually shown using biproducts (cf. [34, Theorem 4.5]):

Proposition VII.3. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a dagger compact category.

1. If $\mathcal{C}$ has zero morphisms and dagger (causal) disjoint embeddings, so does $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$.
2. If $\mathcal{C}$ is also dagger semi-additive, so is $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$. Hence there is a full embedding:

$$\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})^\oplus \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Split}^\ddagger_\dagger(\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C}))$$

Proof: 1. Since there is a dagger functor $\mathcal{D} \to \mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{D})$ which preserves zeroes and is surjective on objects.

2. In [33, Lemma 4.7(c)] it is established that when $\mathcal{D}$ has dagger biproducts, $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{D})$ is closed under addition in $\mathcal{D}$. The proof for disjoint embeddings is the same. The final statement uses (the dagger version of) Theorem III.14. ∎

C. The CP* construction and decoherence structures

Aside from biproducts and idempotents, there is a third treatment of hybrid classical-quantum systems which makes sense in any dagger monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$. In the previous Section we already encountered (dagger special) Frobenius structures. Frobenius structures in $\mathcal{C}$ and certain morphisms between them form the objects of a category $\mathsf{CP}^*(\mathcal{C})$, motivated by the following result from [35], extending Example VI.5:

$$\mathsf{CP}^*(\mathbf{FHilb}) \simeq \mathbf{CStar}$$

An axiomatisation of the CP^* construction, extending that for CPM, has been given by Cunningham and Heunen [20]. Given an environment structure, observe that for each Frobenius structure in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}$, the morphism

$$\lambda \circ (\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}) \circ \delta$$

is a causal dagger idempotent. A *decoherence structure* is then a choice of dagger splitting for each such idempotent, in a way compatible with the monoidal structure. Phrased in these terms, we immediately have the following connection with idempotents:

Proposition VII.4. Let $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}, \dagger)$ be an environment structure. Then $\mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}_{\dagger}(\mathcal{D})$ comes with a canonical decoherence structure.

Under a mild extra assumption known as *positive dimensionality*, any decoherence structure induces a faithful (causal, dagger) functor [20]:

$$\mathsf{CP}^*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pure}}) \to \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}_{\dagger}(\mathcal{D})$$

Moreover, results of Heunen, Kissinger and Selinger [26] tell us that, whenever purification is satisfied, so that $\mathcal{D}$ is of the form $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$ for some $\mathcal{C}$, this is a full causal embedding. Further, they show that when $\mathcal{C}$ has dagger biproducts, the causal embeddings from each construction factor as:

$$\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})^{\oplus} \hookrightarrow \mathsf{CP}^*(\mathcal{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}_{\dagger}(\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})) \hookrightarrow \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})) \tag{8}$$

Then using Corollary III.16 we have the following:

Corollary VII.5. Let $\mathcal{C}$ have dagger biproducts, and suppose $\mathsf{CPM}(\mathcal{C})$ has the finite decomposition property. Then each of the inclusions (8) are (causal, monoidal) equivalences of categories.

In particular, the case $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{FHilb}$ gives equivalences:

$$\mathbf{Quant}^{\oplus} \simeq \mathbf{CStar} \simeq \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}_{\dagger}(\mathbf{Quant}) \simeq \mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{Quant})$$

extending the result from [26].

VIII. Conclusion

We explored two seemingly unrelated categorical representations of classicality, through the $\mathsf{Split}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}$ constructions, finding clear properties ensuring that they coincide – the existence of disjoint embeddings and the finite decomposition property – and moreover that these hold in the case of quantum theory. This is perhaps surprising given the apparent differences between the physical motivations and definitions of these approaches.

Our core technical result was Corollary IV.4 which strengthened the result of Heunen-Kissinger-Selinger [26], by removing all mention of daggers, to show that all (sub)causal idempotents in $\mathbf{CStar}$ causally split. This strengthening allows for a clear physical interpretation. In particular, we saw that we may obtain all of the usual C*-algebraic structure simply from the concept of leaking information (Section VI). Since the results of Section III do not crucially rely on the discarding structure, the obvious open question is whether the restriction to (sub)causal idempotents, though physically well motivated (see Remark II.5) is needed, i.e.:

Do *all* idempotents in $\mathbf{CStar}$ split?

Along with the removal of reference to daggers, our approach is much more general, not relying even on monoidal structure. In particular, compact closed structure is not necessary, opening the way to considering the infinite-dimensional case. In particular, we may ask:

Do all (sub-causal) idempotents split (causally)
in the category of (finite or infinite-dimensional)
C*-algebras and completely positive maps?

While the existence of disjoint embeddings has a reasonable physical interpretation (see Remark III.13), our main result also relied on the finite decomposition property, which is less well understood. In particular:

Are there any clear physical principles which allow
one to deduce the finite decomposition property?

A positive answer to this would yield a more insightful proof of Corollary IV.4. Conversely, what other interesting physical consequences does this property have?

Acknowledgment

Bob Coecke was supported by AFOSR grant Algorithmic and Logical Aspects when Composing Meanings. John Selby was supported by the EPSRC through the Controlled Quantum Dynamics Centre for Doctoral Training. Sean Tull was supported by EPSRC Studentship OUCL/2014/SET.

References

[1] S. Abramsky and B. Coecke. A categorical semantics of quantum protocols. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 415–425, 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0402130.

[2] A. Asperti and G. Longo. *Categories, types, and structures: an introduction to category theory for the working computer scientist*. MIT press, 1991.

[3] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher. Noncommuting mixed states cannot be broadcast. *Physical Review Letters*, 76:2818, 1996.

[4] R. Blume-Kohout, H. K. Ng, D. Poulin, and L. Viola. Information-preserving structures: A general framework for quantum zero-error information. *Physical Review A*, 82(6):062306, 2010.

[5] F. Borceux and D. Dejean. Cauchy completion in category theory. *Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques*, 27(2):133–146, 1986.

[6] O. Bratteli. Inductive limits of finite dimensional C*-algebras. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 171:195–234, 1972.

[7] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti. Probabilistic theories with purification. *Physical Review A*, 81(6):062348, 2010.

[8] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti. Informational derivation of quantum theory. *Physical Review A*, 84(1):012311, 2011.

[9] K. Cho, B. Jacobs, B. Westerbaan, and A. Westerbaan. An introduction to effectus theory. *arXiv:1512.05813*, 2015.

[10] B. Coecke. Axiomatic description of mixed states from Selinger's CPM-construction. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 210:3–13, 2008.

[11] B. Coecke. Terminality implies non-signalling. arXiv:1405.3681, 2014.

[12] B. Coecke, R. Duncan, A. Kissinger, and Q. Wang. Strong complementarity and non-locality in categorical quantum mechanics. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2012. arXiv:1203.4988.

[13] B. Coecke, C. Heunen, and A. Kissinger. Categories of quantum and classical channels. arXiv:1305.3821, 2013.

[14] B. Coecke and A. Kissinger. Categorical quantum mechanics I: causal quantum processes. In E. Landry, editor, *Categories for the Working Philosopher*. Oxford University Press, 2016. arXiv:1510.05468.

[15] B. Coecke and A. Kissinger. *Picturing Quantum Processes. A First Course in Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

[16] B. Coecke, É. O. Paquette, and D. Pavlović. Classical and quantum structuralism. In S. Gay and I. Mackie, editors, *Semantic Techniques in Quantum Computation*, pages 29–69. Cambridge University Press, 2010. arXiv:0904.1997.

[17] B. Coecke and D. Pavlovic. Quantum measurements without sums. In G. Chen, L. Kauffman, and S. Lamonaco, editors, *Mathematics of Quantum Computing and Technology*, pages 567–604. Taylor and Francis, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0608035.

[18] B. Coecke and S. Perdrix. Environment and classical channels in categorical quantum mechanics. In *Proceedings of the 19th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL)*, volume 6247 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 230–244, 2010. Extended version: arXiv:1004.1598.

[19] H. Cohn. Projective geometry over F_1 and the Gaussian binomial coefficients. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 111(6):487–495, 2004.

[20] O. Cunningham and C. Heunen. Axiomatizing complete positivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02931*, 2015.

[21] R. DeMarr. Nonnegative idempotent matrices. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 45(2):185–188, 1974.

[22] R. Duncan and K. Dunne. Interacting Frobenius algebras are hopf. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2016. arXiv:1601.04964.

[23] P. Flor. On groups of non-negative matrices. *Compositio Mathematica*, 21(4):376–382, 1969.

[24] A. Hadzihasanovic. A diagrammatic axiomatisation for qubit entanglement. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2015. arXiv:1501.07082.

[25] L. Hardy and W. K. Wootters. Limited holism and real-vector-space quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics*, 42(3):454–473, 2012.

[26] C. Heunen, A. Kissinger, and P. Selinger. Completely positive projections and biproducts. In Bob Coecke and Matty Hoban, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic*, volume 171 of *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 71–83. Open Publishing Association, 2014.

[27] J. Lambek and P. J. Scott. *Introduction to Higher-order Categorical Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 1988.

[28] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Springer-verlag, 1998.

[29] L. Masanes, M. P. Müller, R. Augusiak, and D. Pérez-García. Existence of an information unit as a postulate of quantum theory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(41):16373–16377, 2013.

[30] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland. Modal quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics*, 42(7):918–925, 2012.

[31] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland. Almost quantum theory. In *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, pages 45–81. Springer, 2016.

[32] J. Selby and B. Coecke. Leaks: quantum, classical and intermediate. *arXiv*, 2017.

[33] P. Selinger. Dagger compact closed categories and completely positive maps. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 170:139–163, 2007.

[34] P. Selinger. Idempotents in dagger categories (extended abstract). *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 210:107–122, 2008.

[35] J. Vicary. Categorical formulation of finite-dimensional quantum algebras. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 304(3):765–796, 2011.

[36] J. Vicary. Higher semantics of quantum protocols. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 606–615. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.

[37] J. Vicary. The topology of quantum algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 93–102. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.